

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Airway Occlusion Pressure Revisited.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/35w0j26j>

Journal

American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine, 201(9)

ISSN

1073-449X

Authors

Sassoon, Catherine S
Younes, Magdy

Publication Date

2020-05-01

DOI

10.1164/rccm.202003-0585ed

Peer reviewed

samples, and with a high prevalence of bronchiectasis—the latter proving to be a major predictor of CBI. These factors may limit the generalizability of the results and call for them to be validated. Lastly, the definition of CBI was not based on a single baseline assessment but on repeated sampling over time, which complicates its clinical utility as a risk prediction tool and may have confounded the observed relationship between CBI and pneumonia.

The results of this study are biologically plausible and logically appealing. The presence of low blood eosinophil counts and/or CBI appear to be risk factors that increase pneumonia risk and, therefore, influence the benefit–risk calculation for the use of ICS in COPD. That said, large-scale, routine, and repeated sputum collection and analysis poses logistic and implementation challenges, particularly in primary care. Unless this practical hurdle is overcome, it seems likely that decisions about ICS use will remain part science, part art. ■

Author disclosures are available with the text of this article at www.atsjournals.org.

Mark T. Dransfield, M.D.
Division of Pulmonary, Allergy, and Critical Care
University of Alabama at Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama
and
Birmingham VA Medical Center
Birmingham, Alabama

Dave Singh, M.D.
Manchester Academic Health Science Centre
The University of Manchester
Manchester, United Kingdom
and
Medicines Evaluation Unit
Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Manchester, United Kingdom

References

1. Kew KM, Seniukovich A. Inhaled steroids and risk of pneumonia for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014; (3):CD010115.
2. Agusti A, Fabbri LM, Singh D, Vestbo J, Celli B, Franssen FME, *et al*. Inhaled corticosteroids in COPD: friend or foe? *Eur Respir J* 2018;52:1801219.
3. Pascoe S, Barnes N, Brusselle G, Compton C, Criner GJ, Dransfield MT, *et al*. Blood eosinophils and treatment response with triple and dual combination therapy in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: analysis of the IMPACT trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2019;7:745–756.
4. Singh D. Predicting corticosteroid response in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: blood eosinophils gain momentum. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2017;196:1098–1100.
5. Singh D, Agusti A, Anzueto A, Barnes PJ, Bourbeau J, Celli BR, *et al*. Global strategy for the diagnosis, management, and prevention of chronic obstructive lung disease: the GOLD science committee report 2019. *Eur Respir J* 2019;53:1900164.
6. Martinez-Garcia MA, Faner R, Oscullo G, de la Rosa D, Soler-Cataluña J-J, Ballester M, *et al*. Inhaled steroids, circulating eosinophils, chronic airway infection, and pneumonia risk in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a network analysis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2020;201:1078–1085.
7. Crim C, Calverley PM, Anderson JA, Celli B, Ferguson GT, Jenkins C, *et al*. Pneumonia risk in COPD patients receiving inhaled corticosteroids alone or in combination: TORCH study results. *Eur Respir J* 2009;34:641–647.
8. Crim C, Dransfield MT, Bourbeau J, Jones PW, Hanania NA, Mahler DA, *et al*. Pneumonia risk with inhaled fluticasone furoate and vilanterol compared with vilanterol alone in patients with COPD. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2015;12:27–34.
9. Agusti A, Fabbri LM, Singh D, Vestbo J, Celli B, Franssen FME, *et al*. Inhaled corticosteroids in COPD: friend or foe? *Eur Respir J* 2018;52:1801219.
10. Pavord ID, Lettis S, Anzueto A, Barnes N. Blood eosinophil count and pneumonia risk in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a patient-level meta-analysis. *Lancet Respir Med* 2016;4:731–741.
11. Vestbo J, Anderson JA, Brook RD, Calverley PM, Celli BR, Crim C, *et al*; SUMMIT Investigators. Fluticasone furoate and vilanterol and survival in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease with heightened cardiovascular risk (SUMMIT): a double-blind randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2016;387:1817–1826.
12. Papi A, Vestbo J, Fabbri L, Corradi M, Prunier H, Cohuet G, *et al*. Extrafine inhaled triple therapy versus dual bronchodilator therapy in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (TRIBUTE): a double-blind, parallel group, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2018;391:1076–1084.
13. Kolsum U, Donaldson GC, Singh R, Barker BL, Gupta V, George L, *et al*. Blood and sputum eosinophils in COPD; relationship with bacterial load. *Respir Res* 2017;18:88.
14. Garnacho-Montero J, Huici-Moreno MJ, Gutiérrez-Pizarra A, López I, Márquez-Vácaro JA, Macher H, *et al*. Prognostic and diagnostic value of eosinopenia, C-reactive protein, procalcitonin, and circulating cell-free DNA in critically ill patients admitted with suspicion of sepsis. *Crit Care* 2014;18:R116.
15. George L, Wright A, Mistry V, Sutcliffe A, Chachi L, Haldar K, *et al*. Sputum *Streptococcus pneumoniae* is reduced in COPD following treatment with benralizumab. *Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis* 2019;14:1177–1185.

Copyright © 2020 by the American Thoracic Society



Ⓐ Airway Occlusion Pressure Revisited

The use of airway occlusion pressure (P0.1) as a measure of respiratory drive was introduced by Whitlaw and colleagues 45 years ago based on

two basic assumptions (1). First, in the absence of flow or volume change during the occlusion, pressure generated by the inspiratory muscles is transmitted directly (1:1 ratio) to the external airway. Second, if the occlusion is brief (i.e., 0.1 s), there is no time for behavioral responses to influence the pressure output of the inspiratory muscles. Hence, the change in airway pressure during a constant brief time reflects the rate of rise of inspiratory muscle pressure at the beginning of spontaneous inspiration, which has been shown to correlate well with the rate of rise of inspiratory muscle activity, at least in normal subjects.

ⒶThis article is open access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives License 4.0 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). For commercial usage and reprints, please contact Diane Gern (dgern@thoracic.org).

Originally Published in Press as DOI: 10.1164/rccm.202003-0585ED on March 23, 2020

Although the second tenet still holds true, several factors were subsequently identified that can alter the relation between P0.1 and inspiratory muscle pressure or electrical diaphragm muscle output in the absence of volume changes or behavioral responses. As noted by Whitelaw and Derenne in 1993, these factors include the presence of dynamic hyperinflation, expiratory muscle activity, chest wall distortion, respiratory muscle weakness, neuromuscular junction blockade, and the shape of the inspiratory pressure waveform (2). All of these modifiers apply to critically ill patients. In addition, the method used to measure P0.1 in such patients is of critical importance depending on whether a true occlusion is implemented, whether measurements are made close to the patient or remotely in the ventilator, what type of triggering is used, and other technical factors. Almost certainly, because of the numerous variables that modify the relation between P0.1 and inspiratory muscle pressure output or drive, the results of P0.1 in weaning assessments, even when measured properly with specialized equipment, have been variable and generally not impressive. There is, however, evidence that an excessively high or excessively low respiratory drive in patients is an important risk factor for continued ventilator dependence (3, 4). Identifying such patients would be of clinical value because this might spare them from being subjected to unsuccessful weaning trials and point to the abnormality that needs to be addressed.

The use of specialized equipment to measure P0.1 in the ICU is a major deterrent to such studies because the setup, proper application of occlusion, and assessment of the quality of the results require considerable expertise. Several commercially available ventilators measure P0.1 and display the results on the ventilator screen. The methods used by these ventilators vary but do not include the desirable application of occlusion near the patient's airway, and some ventilators do not even apply a true occlusion. An important practical question, therefore, is whether the ventilator-generated P0.1 is an adequate surrogate for the more complex and demanding use of specialized equipment.

In a study presented in this issue of the *Journal*, Telias and colleagues (pp. 1086–1098) compared P0.1 estimated by different commercial ventilators (P0.1_{vent}) with values obtained in the proper way (P0.1_{ref}) in critically ill patients and in a bench test using a simulator (5). In addition, they determined the relation between P0.1 and the pressure–time product of the inspiratory muscles. Not surprisingly, there were good correlations between P0.1 and pressure output in individual patients, consistent with the fact that airway pressure is directly related to respiratory muscle output during occluded breaths. Also, as expected from the various known modifiers of the relationship between P0.1 and inspiratory muscle pressure, there was much scatter in this relationship among patients. There are several important novel findings from this study. First, P0.1 measured by ventilators that apply a true end-expiratory occlusion accurately reflects P0.1_{ref} in bench testing, whereas ventilators that do not apply occlusion are inaccurate. Second, on average, P0.1 measured by the more accurate ventilators in patients has little systematic error (minimal bias), and therefore these average values can be used to evaluate the impact of P0.1 on outcomes in group comparisons. Third, having defined a high respiratory output as P0.1 > 4.0 cm H₂O and a low output as <1.1 cm H₂O measured by P0.1_{ref}, and notwithstanding the large differences between P0.1_{vent} and P0.1_{ref} in individual patients, P0.1_{vent} could identify patients above and below these thresholds with reasonable accuracy. A limitation exists in that although the thresholds of P0.1_{ref} have been validated, those of P0.1_{vent} have not.

These results are encouraging in that they suggest that P0.1 displayed in select ventilators can be used to identify patients with abnormally high and low values. Some caveats remain, however. First, as the authors acknowledge, the thresholds used to set limits on high risk are derived from retrospective analyses of patients with weaning failure. It is not clear whether respiratory muscle output in these patients was the only or main reason for weaning failure. Second, the thresholds selected here apply to only a small fraction of the patients studied; in most patients, P0.1 was between the high and low thresholds, and in such patients the P0.1 results would be equivocal.

Knowledge in physiology in the interpretation of P0.1 is indispensable. In the extremes, as mentioned above, variables that modify P0.1 measurements may create conflicting results regarding the relationship between P0.1 (as an estimate of respiratory drive) and inspiratory muscle pressure output. In the presence of muscle weakness, high chest wall elastance, dynamic hyperinflation, or chest wall–abdominal paradox, a high respiratory drive associated with respiratory distress may yield low inspiratory muscle effort and P0.1 (6). Conversely, a low respiratory drive is not inevitably associated with low inspiratory muscle effort and low P0.1. For example, expiratory muscle recruitment in response to external positive end-expiratory pressure may be associated with high P0.1 despite a weak inspiratory effort (2). Important questions remain: 1) what is the threshold of inspiratory muscle effort–induced injury, and 2) does monitoring of P0.1 and inspiratory muscle efforts in critically ill patients receiving mechanical ventilation alter clinical outcomes? Future prospective studies will need to address these questions. ■

Author disclosures are available with the text of this article at www.atsjournals.org.

Catherine S. Sassoon, M.D.
Department of Medicine
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, California

Magdy Younes, M.D., Ph.D.
Department of Medicine
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

References

- Whitelaw WA, Derenne JP, Milic-Emili J. Occlusion pressure as a measure of respiratory center output in conscious man. *Respir Physiol* 1975;23:181–199.
- Whitelaw WA, Derenne JP. Airway occlusion pressure. *J Appl Physiol* (1985) 1993;74:1475–1483.
- Vaporidi K, Akoumianaki E, Telias I, Goligher EC, Brochard L, Georgopoulos D. Respiratory drive in critically ill patients. Pathophysiology and clinical implications. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2020;201:20–32.
- Goligher EC, Dres M, Fan E, Rubenfeld GD, Scales DC, Herridge MS, et al. Mechanical ventilation-induced diaphragm atrophy strongly impacts clinical outcomes. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2018;197:204–213.
- Telias I, Junhasavasdikul D, Rittayamai N, Piquilloud L, Chen L, Ferguson ND, et al. Airway occlusion pressure as an estimate of respiratory drive and inspiratory effort during assisted ventilation. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2020;201:1086–1098.
- Spinelli E, Mauri T, Beitler JR, Pesenti A, Brodie D. Respiratory drive in the acute respiratory distress syndrome: pathophysiology, monitoring, and therapeutic interventions. *Intensive Care Med* 2020; 46:606–618.

Copyright © 2020 by the American Thoracic Society